

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 4, 13-30, and 32-34 are canceled, claims 1, 6-11, and 31 are amended, and claims 35-79 are added.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-12, 31, 35-79 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Claims 14-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for reciting the limitation “the computer readable medium” and having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation. Claims 14-25 have been canceled.

Claims 1-4, 10, 12-16, 22, 24, 25, 27-30, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Vleet (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0033803). Claims 5-9, 11, 17-21, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet in view of Cotton (U.S. Patent 7,016,919). Claims 26 and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vleet in view of Dugan (U.S. Patent 6,779,030).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as applied to the amended claims.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites a method for capturing event data associated with a plurality of different types of articles generated by a plurality of different client applications:

- storing a plurality of event schemas, each event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles;
- detecting an event, the event including a user interaction with an article;
- responsive to the event, determining an event schema associated with the type of the article; and
- storing event data identifying the event and the article using the selected event schema.

The claimed method enables the use of different event schemas to capture the various events that occur on a client device, where there are different types of articles with which a user interacts. The claimed method uses multiple article types with each event schema associated with at least one of the types of articles and with event data identifying the event and the article stored using the selected event schema. This is beneficial for several reasons. First, it enables capture of event data for an article using an event schema that is adapted to the article type. Second, the capture of event data for an article using an event schema adapted to the article type beneficially improves indexing, storing, and searching of the event data associated with various articles based on article type.

Vleet does not disclose the claimed method. Vleet discloses capturing information for only a single type of document, web pages, that are associated with a website. Thus, Vleet does not have different schemas for different types of articles associated with different client applications. Accordingly, Vleet does not store a plurality of event schemas for different article types. Further, Vleet does not store data using multiple event schemas. As a result, Vleet does not afford the benefits that come from the ability to store, index, and search event data according to article type.

New independent claims 42 and 61 recite similar features to claim 1. Thus, Vleet does not disclose the elements of the claimed invention and hence independent claims 1, 42, and 61 are allowable over Vleet. The dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

With respect to claims 5-9 and 11, the combination of Vleet and Cotton does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Cotton discloses a web-based framework wherein events and

associated timestamps and traceability reports are stored with the meta-data associated with application data, thereby creating a history of all events that have occurred with the data [col. 4, lines 34-37]. Vleet also discloses an event history server system [Abstract]. At best then, Vleet and Cotton merely teach a system for storing a history of event data, as event objects with fixed components, from a single source such as web pages, together with meta-data that contain timestamps and traceability reports. Vleet and Cotton do not register different schemas for different types of articles associated with different client applications. Accordingly, Vleet and Cotton do not disclose the claimed invention.

With respect to amended claim 31, the combination of Vleet and Dugan does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Dugan discloses a telecommunications switching network that maintains a priority event queue for holding service related event information received during the processing of the information [col. 44, lines 61-66]. At best, Vleet and Dugan merely teach a system for storing, from a priority queue, a history of event data from a single source such as web pages, as event objects with fixed components. Vleet and Dugan do not have different schemas for different types of articles associated with different client applications. Accordingly, Vleet and Dugan do not store a plurality of event schemas for different article types. Further, Vleet and Dugan do not place events in a queue in the format described by one of a plurality of event schemas. Accordingly, Vleet and Dugan do not disclose the claimed invention.

Collectively, the references fail to teach or suggest using different schemas for different types of articles associated with different client applications, and further, fail to teach storing data using these different event schemas.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney if it would be beneficial to further advance the prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
MIHAI FLORIN IONESCU ET AL.

Dated: June 25, 2007

By: /Robert R. Sachs/

Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2410
Fax: (415) 281-1350
Email: rsachs@fenwick.com